



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
2000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20350-2000

IN REPLY REFER TO

5090

Ser N453D/1U595697

NOV 29 2001

From: Chief of Naval Operations

To: Distribution

Subj: POLICY FOR CONDUCTING COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL
RESPONSE, COMPENSATION, AND LIABILITY ACT (CERCLA)
STATUTORY FIVE-YEAR REVIEWS, NOVEMBER 2001

Ref: (a) Navy/Marine Corps Installation Restoration Manual
(Feb 97)

Encl: (1) Navy/Marine Corps Policy for Conducting Comprehensive
Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability
Act (CERCLA) Statutory Five-year Reviews, November,
2001

1. Enclosure (1) establishes procedures for conducting five-year reviews, facilitates consistency of five-year reviews across the Navy/Marine Corps, clarifies current policy, and delineates roles and responsibilities of various entities in conducting or supporting five-year reviews.


2. The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), requires that remedial actions resulting in any hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remaining at the site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure be reviewed every five years to assure protection of human health and the environment, regardless of the National Priorities List (NPL) status of the site or installation.

3. This policy has been coordinated and concurred with by the Marine Corps.

4. This policy will be included in the next revision to reference (a). It will also be available on the N45 website (<http://web.dandp.com/n45/index.html>) under Environmental Restoration/Training, References.

Subj: POLICY FOR CONDUCTING COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL
RESPONSE, COMPENSATION, AND LIABILITY ACT (CERCLA)
STATUTORY FIVE-YEAR REVIEWS

5. Questions or comments concerning this policy should be
directed to Mr. Geoffrey D. Cullison, CNO N453D, 2211 So. Clark
St., Arlington, VA 22202-3735, (703) 602-5329 (DSN 332-5329),
cullison.geoffrey@hq.navy.mil.



R. T. Nolan
By direction

Distribution:

CINCPACFLT (N465)
CINCLANTFLT (N465)
CMC (LFL)
COMNAVAIRSYSCOM (AIR-8.3)
COMSPAWARESYSCOM (07-1)
COMNAVFACENGCOM (ENV)
COMNAVSEASYSYSCOM (SEA 00T)
COMNAVREG NE (N8)
COMNAVREG MIDLANT (910)
COMNAVREG SE (N4)
NTC GREAT LAKES IL (N45)
CNET (OS441)
COMNAVRESFOR (N464)
COMNAVREG SW (N4)
COMNAVREG PEARL HARBOR HI (N465)
COMNAVMAR (N45)
COMNAVREG NW (N45)

Copy to:

DASN(E)
LANTNAVFACENGCOM (18)
PACNAVFACENGCOM (18)
SOUTHWESTNAVFACENGCOM (18)
SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM (18)
ENGFLDACT CHESAPEAKE (18)
ENGFLDACT NE (18)
ENGFLDACT WEST (18)
ENGFLDACT NW (09E)
ENGFLDACT MW (18)
NFESC (ESC42)

**Navy/Marine Corps Policy for
Conducting Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation,
and Liability Act (CERCLA) Statutory Five-year Reviews
November 2001**

Ref: EPA Comprehensive Five-Year Review Guidance, June 2001, EPA 540-R-01-007, OSWER No. 9355.7-03B-P, §1.3.1

1. Statutory requirements:

a. The statutory requirement for five-year review was added to CERCLA as part of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA). A five-year review is required when **both** of the following conditions are met, whether the site is on the National Priorities List (NPL) or not:

1) Upon completion of the remedial actions at a site, hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants will remain above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. For example, if a site is restricted to industrial use because hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remain above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, five-year reviews must be conducted.

2) The Record of Decision (ROD) or Decision Document (DD) for the site was signed on or after October 17, 1986 (the effective date of SARA).

b. CERCLA §121(c), as amended, states:

If the President selects a remedial action that results in any hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remaining at the site, the President shall review such remedial action no less often than each five-years after the initiation of such remedial action to assure that human health and the environment are being protected by the remedial action being implemented. In addition, if upon such review it is the judgment of the President that action is appropriate at such site in accordance with section [104] or [106], the President shall take or require such action. The President shall report to the Congress a list of facilities for which such review is required, the results of all such reviews, and any actions taken as a result of such reviews.

c. The National Contingency Plan (NCP), 42 U.S.C. § 9621(c), implementing regulations, 40 C.F.R. Part 300.430(f)(4)(ii), provide:

If a remedial action is selected that results in hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remaining at the site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, the lead agency shall review such action no less often than every five years after initiation of the selected remedial action.

d. Consistent with Executive Order 12580, the Secretary of Defense is responsible for ensuring that five-year reviews are conducted at all qualifying Department of Defense (DoD) cleanup sites.

e ... EPA classifies five-year review as either “statutory” or “policy” depending on whether it is required by statute or conducted as a matter of EPA policy. In particular, EPA views five-year reviews conducted of RODS issued before October 17, 1986 as being conducted as a matter of policy because the five-year review requirement didn’t become law until that date. Statutory five-year reviews are required by law and will be conducted by the Navy/Marine Corps at any site meeting the requirements of the law. We generally do not conduct policy five-year reviews.

2. Definitions:

a. For purpose of this policy, “site” means a location on an installation's property where a hazardous substance has been deposited, stored, disposed, or placed, or has otherwise come to be located where, upon completion of the remedial action, hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants will remain at the site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. This includes areas off the installation where contamination may have migrated. For purpose of this policy, “site” also means Operable Unit.

b. “Unlimited use” and “unrestricted exposure” mean that there are no restrictions on the potential use of land or other natural resources.

3. Purpose of a five-year review:

a. The purpose of a five-year review is not to reconsider decisions made during the selection of the remedy, as specified in the ROD, but to evaluate the implementation and performance of the selected remedy.

b. Where a site has a remedial action that is still in the Remedial Action-Construction (RA-C) phase or the Remedial Action-Operations (RA-O) phase, a five-year review should confirm that immediate threats have been addressed and that the remedy will be protective when complete.

c. Where a site is in the Long Term Management (LTMgt) phase, the five-year review should confirm whether the selected remedy remains protective.

d. When the five-year review indicates that the remedy is not performing as designed, the report should recommend actions to improve performance.

4. NPL status: The continuing presence of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure under CERCLA establishes the requirement for a five-year review, not the NPL status of the installation. Reference (a) states that EPA will delete an installation from the NPL when deletion criteria have been satisfied and that an installation will not be kept on the NPL solely because it is subject to five-year reviews. If the installation has been deleted or is in the process of being deleted, the five-year review report should address the status of any deletion action.

5. Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) response: Five-year reviews are not required if cleanup of a site is addressed under RCRA corrective action. In cases where both RCRA and CERCLA authorities are used to address different sites on an installation, a five-year review is only required for those portions of the installation being addressed under CERCLA that meet the criteria for five-year reviews. When a RCRA action is included as a portion of a ROD or DD or other CERCLA decision document, the RCRA action should be included in the five-year review.

6. Interim remedial action: By itself, an interim remedial action at a site does not start the clock for a five year review of that site; it is treated like any other remedial action for the purpose of five-year reviews. An interim remedial action triggers the five-year review clock if it meets any of the criteria outlined in paragraph 1. above. For instance, if an alternate water supply is installed but hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remain onsite above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, a review is required by statute. A subsequent action may then reduce the hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants to levels allowing unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. Remedial actions are those actions consistent with a permanent remedy taken instead of, or in addition to, removal action.

7. Five-year review “trigger”:

a. In keeping with the requirements of CERCLA §121(c) and the NCP, initiation of the selected remedial action that will result in hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remaining at the site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure after the remedial action is complete is the “trigger” that starts the five-year review clock. For most Navy/Marine Corps sites, this “trigger” is the onsite mobilization for commencement of the RA-C phase.

b. The first site on an installation that triggers the five-year review clock triggers the five year review clock for the entire installation, or that portion of the installation addressed under the ROD or DD.

c. Where the selected remedy will result in hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remaining at the site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure but will not require a RA-C phase, such as monitored natural attenuation using existing wells and/or institutional controls, the remedy start date is the ROD or DD signature date and therefore is also the trigger for the five-year review clock.

8. Five-year review due dates:

a. The five-year review report for a site is to be completed and signed within five years of the trigger date for that site. Subsequent five-year reviews should be signed no later than five-years after the signature date of the previous five-year review reports.

b. Because the regulators do not have a statutory role in the conduct of five-year reviews, it will be up to Navy/Marine Corps to enforce the five-year review dates. To assist the field in tracking five-year review dates, there is a field in NORM that allows management to track these dates.

9. Results of a five-year review: The results of the five-year review are presented in a five-year review report.

a. The five-year review report should;

1) clearly state whether the remedy is or is expected to be protective,

2) document any deficiencies identified during the review, and

3) recommend specific actions to ensure that a remedy will be or will continue to be protective.

b. Where necessary, five-year review reports should include descriptions of follow-up actions needed to achieve, or to continue to ensure, protectiveness. Along with these recommendations, the report should list a timetable for performing the actions and the parties responsible for implementation.

c. If it is determined that cleanup levels or remedial action objectives cannot be achieved through the remedial action, the recommendations may suggest the type of decision process (e.g., ROD or DD, ROD or DD Amendment, Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD)) needed to evaluate or make changes to the remedy, cleanup levels, or remedial action objectives.

d. For sites that are still in the RA-O phase (pre-Response complete) where evaluation and optimization of the remedial action operations are performed routinely, most information for the five-year review should be readily available.

10. Review and Signature: Pursuant to the delegations of authority in sections 2(d) and 11(g) of Executive Order 12580, and DoD Instruction 4715.7 of 22 April, 1996, Department of the Navy (DON) is the approval authority for CERCLA five-year reviews conducted at sites under its jurisdiction, custody or control.

a. Five-year reviews completed with ER,N or BRAC funds will be signed by the Commanding Officer of the supporting EFD/A.

b. Five-year reviews completed with installation funds will be signed by the installation Commanding Officer/Commanding General or a designee of the Regional Environmental Coordinator.

c. Regulatory agencies have no statutory review authority in five-year reviews conducted by DON in its Lead Agent authority except where some past DON Federal Facility Agreements (FFAs) have included five-year review reports as enforceable primary documents. Future FFAs and Federal Facility-State Remediation Agreements (FFSRAs) are not to include five-year review reports as either primary or secondary documents. However, five-year reviews may be submitted to the appropriate regulators for their review and comment as a matter of partnering.

11. Keeping the community informed:

a. Because the five-year review addresses the status and protectiveness of a remedy, it should be used to communicate this information to the community. If the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) is still active at the installation, preparation for and conduct of the five-year review should be an agenda item at each RAB meeting conducted while the five-year review is underway. Where necessary, additional RAB meetings should be held to ensure the community is kept up to date on progress and results of the five-year review. If the RAB is inactive or has disbanded, the installation shall determine the most effective approach to informing the community based on the level of community interest. At a minimum, community involvement activities during the five-year review should include notifying the community that the five-year review will be conducted, notifying the community that the five-year review has been completed, and providing the results of the review to the local site repository.

b. The installation Public Affairs Officer can recommend appropriate methods of communication (e.g., public notices, fact sheets) for notifying the public.

c. Upon completion of the five-year review and Five-Year Review Report, a brief summary of the report should be made available to the stakeholders. The summary should include a short description of the remedial action, any deficiencies, recommendations and follow-up actions that are directly related to protectiveness of the remedy, and the determination(s) of whether the remedy is or is expected to be protective of human health and the environment. The summary should also provide the location of the site information repository and/or where a copy of the complete report can be obtained, and provide the date of the next five-year review or notify the community when five-year reviews will no longer be necessary.

e. Five year reviews are not Administrative Record material and are not to be included therein. However, the RPM should ensure that the signed five-year review report is placed in the site information repository.

12. Discontinuing five-year reviews:

a. There is no statutory provision for the discontinuation of statutory reviews. However, EPA acknowledges in reference (a) that five-year reviews may no longer be needed when no hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remain on site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, reference (a), paragraph 1.2.4. The basis for this finding should be documented in the final Five-Year Review report.

b. If a ROD or DD states that a five-year review will be performed, but prior to conducting the first review the EFD/EFA determines that no review is required, this finding should be recorded in a major document subject to public comment, such as a Proposed Plan or a Notice of Intent to Delete.